

## **EXHIBIT 14**



## CARROLL COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

125 N. Court Street • Westminster, MD 21157

410-751-3000

TTY 410-751-3034

FAX 410-751-3003

STEPHEN H. GUTHRIE

*Superintendent*

June 12, 2012

The Honorable Richard Rothschild, Vice President  
Board of Carroll County Commissioners  
Carroll County Government  
225 N. Center Street  
Westminster, Maryland 21157

Dear Commissioner Rothschild *Rich*

I am writing to update you on our progress with the Comprehensive Facilities Utilization Study and also ask you for your assistance. As you are aware, we have begun the study and it is scheduled to be completed in December.

First, let me thank you for completing the initial community survey, which I informed you of by letter on May 30, 2012. I would like the Board of Commissioners to become further involved by recommending two representatives to participate in the study by serving on the work teams. As the committee work is now underway, I hope to receive these names as soon as possible. If you provide me with the names and contact information for recommended participants, Mr. O'Neal, who is coordinating this effort, will immediately involve them.

In addition to the data obtained through the initial, community survey, our process will incorporate a tremendous amount of research to include applicable laws, regulations and policies, data review and analysis, stakeholder input, and industry standards, where appropriate. As a part of this research, I am interested in providing the study group with additional information based on the thoughts of the Commissioners. I am not looking for a consensus, but informal reactions to questions being raised that fall outside of my authority or that of the Board of Education.

To that end, Mr. Jon O'Neal and I will be making appointments to meet with you and discuss your reactions to these outstanding questions. However, to give you a sense of what we are asking, below are some of the questions being raised by our citizens now that they are aware of the study:

1. Should the Board of Education vote to close a school(s) and the facility reverts back to County what are the planned actions that the you feel is appropriate to take with the facility;
2. Should the Board of Education vote to close a school(s) and the property reverts back to County, what are the planned actions do you feel is appropriate to take with the property;
3. Should the public use of facilities both in the building and the fields that presently occur at each school facility continue;
4. If the you feel that the property should be sold, what impact, if any, will the proceeds have on the school system's operating or capital budget;

5. Is your response to question #4 different if debt is still owed on the facility and/or property;
6. Is real estate market information for school facilities and property available;
7. What are your thoughts for both the system-wide and individual school levels for enrollment versus capacity, assuming that the Commissioners do not believe that each school in the county should be at 100% of capacity;
8. Relative to question #7, which of the following factors do you think are legitimate considerations when determining the ideal enrollment versus capacity ratio:
  - a. Room for future growth in overall student population;
  - b. Special education programs and students that have a very disproportionate ratio of student to teacher space and staffing; and
  - c. Negative impact on the general student-teacher ratio and class size that would result in a misalignment with state law, regulation, or Board of Education policy; and
9. Do you support using existing space for developing programs that will provide better service to Carroll students, which may include initial start-up costs, if there are also a future operational savings possible? For instance, the development of special education programs that will both return non-public out-of-county students to Carroll and avoid the future placement of students out-of-county.

For this information to be considered fully as a part of the study, I hope to meet with all of you no later than July 16, 2012. I understand that the request for Commissioners' representatives may require public discussion by the Commissioners and, as always, I will make my staff available to assist in that discussion.

Finally, I want to ensure that you are available to participate in a joint work session with the Board of Education on January 9, 2013. We will formally present the results of the committee's work at this meeting. We will review the process of the study and obtain reactions to possible actions based on the options presented. It remains the goal to complete the report from the study and present it to both boards in December 2012, allowing for time to review the report in advance of the work session. From my perspective it is imperative that the boards jointly discuss the findings of the study and attempt to achieve consensus for action.

The Board of Education and I are fully committed to working in partnership with the Board of Commissioners on this project. Thank you in advance for the consideration that the Board of Commissioners will give the specifics of this request. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Stephen H. Guthrie  
Superintendent of Schools

c: Board of Education  
File

Discussion with Commissioner Rothschild  
Facilities Study  
August 20, 2012

SHG shared the purpose of these discussions. No ascribing comments to specific Commissioners. Synthesize comments and then review for common ground.

1. Should the Board of Education vote to close a school(s) and the facility reverts back to County what are the planned actions that the you feel is appropriate to take with the facility; SHG provided old examples of Hampstead, Union Bridge, New Windsor, East End, Center Street Elementary School. RR – gut feeling is to not sell, maybe rent. Don't want to give up completely based on trends. Last time tried to buy some land knowing it may grow. SHG - numbers show eventual increase in 2017 at 50 and then 200 per year after that.

RR - Overarching comment, need to bring in Jack Lyburn to obtain marketability of individual properties. Could vet options based on his assessment. Decommission situations should keep grounds available for P&R use. Difficult question is what to do with school. Sell with option to repurchase all the way to "mothball" it. Lease it, redeploy it within government but there would have to be cost-avoidance, which is just a transfer of cost. Same bucket. Ideal seems to be lease facility for 10-20 years. We would have to be careful about conditions of lease to modify buildings.

SHG – Reviewed example of CCCTC for CO as a new possibility. Return Winchester and Kessler to move to CCCTC as new CO. RR – Since DH brought it up, sometimes you go with the momentum there is. Move you to North Carroll, move you to CCCTC, move CCCTC to MVHS, etc. We should have waited until January because this whole thing could be moot (federal election).

2. Should the Board of Education vote to close a school(s) and the property reverts back to County, what are the planned actions do you feel is appropriate to take with the property; SHG – concern was raised by municipalities & agencies. RR – I guess us for maintenance if it reverts. Maybe have private sector manage it. Probably has cost effective.
3. Should the public use of facilities both in the building and the fields that presently occur at each school facility continue; SHG – Also CCC and Rec Councils and community groups. We are confused about where the savings would be. RR – Believes that we should absorb fields cost into Rec & Parks fees. Whoever occupies building uses other space but not the gym and areas Rec & Parks use.

**TO DO – Send Charter School law to Commissioner Frazier. Also funding decisions.**

4. If the you feel that the property should be sold, what impact, if any, will the proceeds have on the school system's operating or capital budget; RR – you want to know who gets the savings. There has to be a benefit to you. At least half to CCPS and half to Counties. And it should free up operational money to give salary and improve increases.

5. Is your response to question #4 different if debt is still owed on the facility and/or property;
6. Is real estate market information for school facilities and property available; SHG – Using exs from first question, SHG mentioned there has not been much of a market. RR – Jack would need to assess.
7. What are your thoughts for both the system-wide and individual school levels for enrollment versus capacity, assuming that the Commissioners do not believe that each school in the county should be at 100% of capacity; SHG – framed this discussion. Offered some explanation and focused on what 100% means. 92-95% would be ideal capacity for us in our mind. Used analogy of unemployment rate. Gave year to year anomalies as well. What are the Commissioners looking at as an ideal? RR – I agree with you. You have to have some reserve capacity. Maybe one third or one half. Not more than half at worse case. Need to also bring Phil Hager into conversation because capacity number may vary by area of the County to address needs.

SHG – Estimates show us returning to growth by 2017 with 200+ increases each year. This is just based on birth rates. RR – I understand. This is not easy.

8. Relative to question #7, which of the following factors do you think are legitimate considerations when determining the ideal enrollment versus capacity ratio:
  - a. Room for future growth in overall student population;
  - b. Special education programs and students that have a very disproportionate ratio of student to teacher space and staffing; and
  - c. Negative impact on the general student-teacher ratio and class size that would result in a misalignment with state law, regulation, or Board of Education policy;

RR – this should be a simple cost-benefit analysis. What is the savings versus immediate benefit of closing a school? Does not have to be mutually exclusive either depending on the options.

9. Do you support using existing space for developing programs that will provide better service to Carroll students, which may include initial start-up costs, if there are also a future operational savings possible? For instance, the development of special education programs that will both return non-public out-of-county students to Carroll and avoid the future placement of students out-of-county. SHG – Beyond closures have asked committee to consider CCPS uses. One focus area has been non-public placements. There can be a cost up front but also savings on back-end. RR – See answer above in #8. Reiterates need to have Jack and Phil review process.